

***PLEASE NOTE: Since the Glendale City Council does not take formal action at the Workshops, Workshop minutes are not approved by the City Council.**

**MINUTES
CITY OF GLENDALE
CITY COUNCIL WORKSHOP
MARCH 6, 2007
1:30 P.M.**

PRESENT: Mayor Elaine M. Scruggs, Vice Mayor Manuel D. Martinez, and Councilmembers Joyce V. Clark, Steven E. Frate, David M. Goulet, Yvonne J. Knaack, and H. Phillip Lieberman

ALSO PRESENT: Ed Beasley, City Manager; Pam Kavanaugh, Assistant City Manager; Craig Tindall, City Attorney; and Pamela Hanna, City Clerk

1. CITY ENTRY MONUMENT & SIGNAGE PROGRAM

CITY STAFF PRESENTING THIS ITEM: Ms. Julie Frisoni, Marketing and Communications Director, Mr. Jon Froke, AICP, Planning Director and Mr. Roger Dybas, Corral Dybas Group, Inc.

This is a request for the City Council to review and discuss the proposed City Entry Monument & Signage Program.

The proposed City Entry Monument & Signage Program incorporates entry monument, welcome, and wayfinding signage. The proposal is intended to comply with the Council's request for a simple, cohesive theme and the desire for signage at more entrance points into the city.

Staff was requested to explore design, color, content, and the location of Glendale's entry welcome signs, as well as to research and develop concepts for new major entry point signage.

A subcommittee comprised of representatives from Field Operations, Marketing and Communications, Planning, and Transportation developed a signage program and presented it to the Council at the April 4, 2006 Workshop. The following information was presented.

After the initial signage program was presented, the city retained the design services of the Corral Dybas Group, Inc. (CDG). CDG is a landscape architecture firm that has been retained by the city for other projects, including the Civic Center and Bead Museum expansion project, four intersection improvement projects on Grand Avenue, and the noise wall mitigation project at the Loop 101. CDG has prepared two design ensembles that include entry monument, wayfinding and welcome signs.

Existing signage in Glendale is as follows:

- ○ **Welcome Signs:** These are metal “Welcome to Glendale” signs that were installed in the early 1990s. Currently, there are 19 welcome signs at various locations in the city. Most are installed where there is a common boundary with another city.
- ○ **Entry Monuments:** These are larger scale masonry and stucco signs. There are three entry monument signs in the city located at: 43rd and Glendale Avenues; 51st Avenue and Thunderbird Road; and 51st Avenue and Bell Road.

The signage program prepared by CDG proposes the following:

- ○ **Welcome Signs:** 41 new welcome signs are proposed at key entry points into the city, including the Loop 303 Corridor and Northern Parkway Corridor. This will replace the 19 existing signs and add 22 new locations.
- ○ **Wayfinding Signage:** Eight wayfinding signs are proposed for placement in Downtown Glendale and the Sports and Entertainment District.
- ○ **Entry Monuments:** Nine new entry monument signs are proposed at key entry points into the city. This includes the replacement of the three existing monuments. These new entry monuments are proposed to be located so motorists, pedestrians and bicyclists can identify when they have left Phoenix and Peoria and have entered Glendale.

At the April 4, 2006 Council Workshop, a proposed signage program was reviewed and staff was directed to redesign the signage, as well as identify additional locations for placement throughout the city.

At the January 3, 2006 Council Workshop, Staff was asked to research and develop concepts for new major entry point signage for the city.

Additional "Welcome to Glendale" signs placed at key locations will assist residents and visitors in identifying when they have entered Glendale. A cohesive theme is promoted with attractive entry monument and welcome signage.

Wayfinding signs will assist pedestrians and motorists in finding their destinations and help to familiarize them with key attractions in Downtown Glendale and the Sports and Entertainment District.

Staff is recommending a phased approach to implementing the proposed signage package over two fiscal years. Phase One funding, in the amount of \$452,088, is available in the Fiscal Year 2007-08 National Events Reserve Fund and aligns with the Council's goal to use a portion of this fund for long-term improvements to the city's right-of-way. The proposed Phase One funding, as well as other National Events Reserve Fund supplementals, will be reviewed in detail with the Council at an upcoming Budget Workshop.

Staff is requesting that Council review the proposed City Entry Monument & Signage Program and provide guidance on the program's design elements and implementation.

Mr. Jon Froke, AICP, Planning Director, stated that he was pleased to return to this meeting after a lot of study on this item over the last few months. He noted that this was a great opportunity for Glendale to review its sign package citywide.

Mr. Roger Dybas, of Corral Dybas Group, Inc. made a brief slide presentation on the two designs being discussed.

Councilmember Goulet inquired as to the physical size of the welcome sign and asked if it would be readable at night. Mr. Dybas stated that it would show brightly at night and will be a 30 by 40 inch sign. The sign with pillars would be about eight feet tall.

Mayor Scruggs inquired as to which date would be placed on the sign in reference to Glendale's establishment. Ms. Julie Frisoni, Marketing and Communications Director, stated that the incorporated date of 1910 would be on the sign not the established date.

Councilmember Clark commented on the ocean blue color proposed for the sign. She stated that she would prefer a truer blue color in its place, which she thought would enhance the lettering.

Mayor Scruggs commented that they were possibly staying in line with the city's colors. Ms. Frisoni explained that they wanted to stay within a particular scheme of colors. She stated that if they were to go darker, they would start deviating from the color and would have an affect on the city's established colors.

Mr. Dybas explained that it was possible to sharpen or tone down the color

should Council so choose. He stated that he was trying to stay consistent with Glendale's civic areas. He provided slides on the sign styles for Council's recommendation. He recommended Council choose one style, however both styles could be used.

Councilmember Lieberman stated that he liked Option A. He said that it also went with the city's logo. He noted that Option B looked like an unfinished sign.

Councilmember Goulet asked if Option A incorporates itself into Option B in some instances. Mr. Dybas stated that he was correct because they come from the same geometric family. Councilmember Goulet inquired as to the maintenance on the two options. He noted that Option A looks to be difficult to keep clean. He would also like information on the maintenance of the other signs. Mr. Dybas stated that they use a powder coating all the signs that cleans up very well. The Option a sign could be hinged to allow for cleaning the less accessible area.

Vice Mayor Martinez stated that he preferred Option A that was in keeping with the city's logo.

Ms. Frisoni explained that the funding costs on both designs were the same.

Mr. Froke stated that the placement of the signs would depend on the site and how much room was available.

Mayor Scruggs had concerns with Option A seeming a bit too large. Mr. Dybas provided measurements on Option A.

Councilmember Clark stated that she preferred Option A because it was in keeping with the elements that the city has used for many years. She added that she was not concerned with the size of the sign because it was for vehicular traffic and should be strong and bold as you enter the city. She had greater concerns with Option B, which was horizontal and closer to the ground.

Councilmember Knaack stated that she also likes Option A. She noted that she also likes Option B; however she does not like the vertical lettering on the side of the sign.

Councilmember Frate asked which would cost more to maintain. Mr. Dybas stated that it was hard to say given the ingenuity of people these days to cause damage. He explained that the fiber reinforced concrete on the signs would shatter on impact and the steel would bend if a vehicular collision were to occur. He added that the Engineering Department had approved the monument designs.

Mr. Froke explained that they had divided the proposed sign package into two phases. Phase One would consist of the Welcome and Wayfinding Signage. This would consist of a one-time cost of \$452,000 and \$24,000 for ongoing operations and maintenance per year. Phase Two would be in next year's fiscal budget, consisting of the Entry Monuments. This would be a one-time cost of \$586,000 and \$45,000 for ongoing repair and maintenance per year.

Councilmember Frate stated that he was pleased that the ongoing cost of repair and maintenance was also included in the package. He said that many times

monuments become weathered and look terrible with no money to repair them.

Councilmember Clark stated that she would like to see a break down of the \$452,000. Ms. Frisoni explained that the Welcome Signs would be done in-house and the cost will be paid from the transportation budget. The figure presented today was for the Wayfinding Signage. Councilmember Clark noted that if broken down by eight signs, they would cost approximately \$50,000 each. She commented that it was a bit high for signs. Mr. Froke explained that with the design and fabrication techniques, he believes it was an appropriate estimate.

Councilmember Frate commented that it did seem like a lot of money, however when you factor in the preparation, installation and materials, it begins to add up.

Mayor Scruggs stated that the majority of Council selected Option A and directed staff to continue the process.

2. 2007 STATE LEGISLATIVE UPDATE AND 2007 FEDERAL LEGISLATIVE UPDATE

CITY STAFF PRESENTING THIS ITEM: Ms. Dana Tranberg, Intergovernmental Programs Director, Ms. Jessica Blazina, Deputy Intergovernmental Programs Director, and Mr. Brent Stoddard, Legislative Coordinator

This is a request for the City Council to provide direction on proposed state legislation, consistent with the approved 2007 state legislative agenda; and provide direction on the 2007 federal legislative agenda.

The purpose of the federal and state legislative agendas is to affect federal and state legislation and regulations as they relate to the interests of the city and its residents.

The 2007 state and federal legislative agendas provide the policy framework by which Intergovernmental Programs staff engages on state and federal legislative issues.

Throughout the 2007 legislative sessions, policy direction will be sought on proposed statutory changes which fall under the adopted council policy statements relating to the financial stability of the city, public safety issues, promoting economic development, managing growth, and preserving neighborhoods.

The Intergovernmental Programs staff recommends prioritizing the state legislative agenda to a few key issues to allow the city to have a stronger, more consistent message on the items of greatest priority. The proposed key priority issues for consideration are described in the reports that were submitted to the Council.

The legislative agenda defines the city's priorities for the upcoming session and will guide the city's lobbying activities at the Arizona State Legislature. The

Intergovernmental Programs staff will come before the Council on a regular basis throughout the session for direction on bills and amendments that may be introduced. The city's legislative agenda is a flexible document and may change, based on activities at the Legislature and Council direction.

The Intergovernmental Programs Department has conducted a citywide assessment of potential federal funding opportunities to be included in the 2007 federal legislative agenda. Based on this assessment, staff recommends pursuing federal funding opportunities, including grant opportunities, line-item appropriations, earmarks and regulation revisions in the areas of: transportation, public safety, homeland security, historic preservation, libraries, youth workforce development, and economic development initiative projects.

The Intergovernmental Programs Department returned at the February 20, 2007 workshop to present the comprehensive 2007 federal legislative agenda, inclusive of funding requests and policy areas for engagement.

On December 19, 2006, the Council approved the 2007 State Legislative Agenda, which included policy statements on municipal legislative priorities and principles.

On January 16, 2007, the Intergovernmental Programs staff presented legislative issues to the Council.

On January 30, 2007, the Intergovernmental Programs staff presented state legislative and federal issues to the Council.

On February 20, 2007, the Intergovernmental Programs staff presented state legislative issues and the 2007 federal legislative agenda to the Council.

The priorities and principles of Glendale's 2007 state legislative agenda provide the venue for the city to identify and engage on state legislative issues. The key principles of the state legislative agenda are to preserve and enhance the city's ability to deliver quality and cost-effective services to citizens and visitors; to address quality of life issues for Glendale residents, and to enhance the City Council's ability to serve the community by retaining local decision making authority and maintain state legislative and voter commitments for revenue sources.

Development of a 2007 federal legislative agenda provides the venue for the city to identify and engage on federal issues of concern to the community, which will enhance the ability of the city to deliver superior services and to address quality of life issues for the residents of Glendale.

Staff is requesting the Council to provide policy direction on the proposed state legislative issues and federal legislative program development.

Ms. Dana Tranberg, Intergovernmental Programs Director, provided a brief summary of legislative discussions on impact fees. She stated that she had participated in a work group of cities and developers in trying to come up with a consensus bill related to impact fee assessment and implementation. She added that the bill brought forward was Senate Bill 1423, which does reflect a consensus. She noted that there were a lot of provisions that the development community wanted that did not get included in this bill. Thru the work group process it became clear that the cities and towns have different methods of assessing impact fees. She stated that the practical implementation of this bill on the City of Glendale are some procedural process changes to accommodate, however the end result does not have a significant impact on what we are currently doing. The key requirements of the bill require a city to create an infrastructure improvement plan that would identify the project that would be used for impact fees and the projects that are required for future growth. In addition, an impact fee study would have to be conducted. The City of Glendale has already instituted a procedure for doing this study.

Ms. Tranberg explained that there was a minor change to the fee schedule when adopting an impact fee. They are requesting an additional two weeks to provide input to council and staff. She stated that in addition, instead of waiting 90 days for new fee implementation it would change to 75 days. Another provision was that Southern Arizona homebuilders were given the option to include the impact fees as part of their closing costs. This was strictly voluntary. She stated that she believes this bill to be a compromise in legislation. Staff's recommendation was to be neutral on this bill.

Mr. Brent Stoddard, Legislative Coordinator, presented Senate Bill 1555. This bill prohibits a person that is convicted of dangerous crimes against children, including sex offenders, from living within 1,500 feet of a primary or secondary school or a licensed childcare facility. He noted that the bill does not cover a person that had been convicted and currently resides in the 1,500 feet threshold. It also excludes anyone who had set up past residency and a new school or daycare should develop. This is a League of Arizona Cities and Towns resolution. Staff recommends support of this bill.

Councilmember Goulet asked how this bill would be enforced and monitored. Mr. Stoddard stated that the bill does not go into detail on how it is to be monitored, however it does provide the penalty that was raised to the highest misdemeanor level possible. Ms. Tranberg stated that certain levels of sex offenders are required to register and that alerts the police department.

Mayor Scruggs asked how this would work with people being convicted while owning a home, and then wanting to come back to their home after they are released. Mr. Stoddard stated that in that situation it would be grandfathered in.

Mayor Scruggs asked if the local police would be the ones enforcing this bill. Mr.

Stoddard stated that she was probably correct.

Councilmember Frate asked if this would pertain to all levels of sex offenders. Mr. Stoddard stated that the bill specifically refers to Dangerous Crimes against Children and it lists and defines in state statute what those dangerous crimes are. Councilmember Frate noted that it would be possibly level one.

Councilmember Clark inquired as to the bill stating that the age of 15 was the cut off point a child was still considered a child legislatively, but legally it was the age of 18. She asked how the age limit was obtained. Mr. Stoddard stated that the dangerous crimes against children act which currently exists in state statute, reads the age of 15 years old as the age being measured.

Mayor Scruggs asked if passage of this law would preclude the council from passing a more stringent ordinance in the future. Mr. Stoddard stated that he would have to look into it.

Mayor Scruggs noted that there were a lot of offenses against children that were not entirely physical. She would like to do more.

Vice Mayor Martinez agreed with Mayor Scruggs. He stated that he would be interested in finding out if a more stringent ordinance is possible should this bill not cover everything intended.

Mr. Stoddard presented House Bill 2066, a strike everything bill. This bill would require all cities to mark all old underground sewer lines within the city. He stated that the city does not own the lines and therefore does not mark them. The gas company marks them when they do maintenance or establish a new line, and they take on the responsibility and cost. Staff does not recommend support of this bill.

Councilmember Clark asked if this bill handles the liability for the city given that they do not have any information on how to identify something very old. Mr. Stoddard responded that it was the precise argument they were making in favor of not supporting this bill.

Councilmember Lieberman agreed with Councilmember Clark.

Ms. Blazina, Deputy Intergovernmental Programs Director, provided information on the initiative reform process, largely as a result of the 19 measures that were on the ballot in November. Staff recommends a neutral position on this item. They will continue to monitor it as it moves forward through the process.

Councilmember Clark inquired on the likelihood of this bill getting through. Ms. Blazina stated that they are still going through many changes; however there have been no new developments. They will continue to update the Council.

Ms. Tranberg provided a federal update. She stated that last week was the deadline to submit their federal requests to the members of Congress. She reminded everyone that next week was the National League of Cities week in D.C. and they will be meeting with Glendale's Congressional Delegation.

Vice Mayor Martinez inquired as to the status of the photo radar on Loop 101. Ms. Tranberg stated that there were two ongoing discussions, one in the Senate that requires it to go to a vote of the people, which is no longer moving forward and one in the Governor's office where an agreement was reached with the City of Scottsdale to temporarily continue their radar while they come up with a more comprehensive plan.

Vice Mayor Martinez asked if anything was moving forward with the state shared revenues. Ms. Tranberg stated that the Senate Appropriations Committee did consider a bill that was introduced that would give a 15% income tax refund to county residents. She said that the bill was defeated. She added that state budget discussions are ongoing.

Vice Mayor Martinez inquired if there had been any discussions on property tax relief for property owners. Ms. Tranberg stated that in November there had been a proposition on the ballot that required a resetting of the property tax base.

Councilmember Clark asked if there had been any discussions on political signage. Ms. Tranberg stated that there had been discussions in their last workshop meeting on a sign bill that was not only for political signs but others as well. She stated that the bill had been amended to only apply to human sign walkers. She stated that the bill was at a stand still thus far.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 2:35 p.m.